



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia, 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/964,211	09/25/2001	Akihiko Ito	333772000101	2026

20872 7590 05/23/2003
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
425 MARKET STREET
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105-2482

EXAMINER
KERVEROS, JAMES C

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2858	

DATE MAILED: 05/23/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/964,211	ITO ET AL.
	Examiner James C Kerveros	Art Unit 2858

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 September 2001.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-87 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-87 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 3.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION***Priority***

The status of nonprovisional parent application should be updated to include the expression "now Patent No. 6,459,259" following the filing date of the parent application.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-87 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-86 of U.S. Patent No. 6,459,259. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claimed invention in the instant Application is

broad in scope, which includes the common claimed limitations disclosed in the Patent 6,459,259.

Regarding Claims 1, 44, the claimed invention recites a method and a system for testing devices carried by at least two test trays, comprising: transporting a first and a second tray along a first and second transport paths to a first and second test position, respectively, and testing at least one device on the first and second tray, at the first and second test position, respectively.

Regarding Claims 22, 65, the claimed invention recites a method and a system for testing devices carried by at least two test trays, comprising: transporting a first and a second tray in parallel to a first test position and a second test position, respectively, and testing at least one device on the first and second tray at the first and second test position, respectively.

The patented claims recite transport mechanisms for providing a plurality of test tray transport paths to transport substantially simultaneously a plurality of test trays in a generally parallel manner from the loader section through the testing section to the unloader section.

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made, to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the common claimed limitations of the Patent for the purpose of defining the claimed invention in the instant Application, since the claimed subject matter is already disclosed in the patent regarding a tester for semiconductor devices and test tray used for the tester.

In this case, the fact that the claims were restricted in the parent application 09/254,084, it does not prohibit a Double Patenting rejection in the present application, see MPEP 804.01.

The following are situations where the prohibition of double patenting rejections under 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply: The claims of the different applications or patents are not consonant with the restriction requirement made by the examiner, since the claims have been changed in material respects from the claims at the time the requirement was made. For example, the divisional application filed includes additional claims not consonant in scope to the original claims subject to restriction in the parent. *Symbol Technologies, Inc. v. Opticon, Inc.*, 935 F.2d 1569, 19 USPQ2d 1241 (Fed. Cir. 1991) and *Gerber Garment Technology, Inc. v. Lectra Systems, Inc.*, 916 F.2d 683, 16 USPQ2d 1436 (Fed. Cir. 1990). In order for consonance to exist, the line of demarcation between the independent and distinct inventions identified by the examiner in the requirement for restriction must be maintained. 916 F.2d at 688, 16 USPQ2d at 1440.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JAMES C. KERVEROS at (703) 305-1081 or the examiner's supervisor, N. LE at (703) 308-1436.

Any inquiry of a general nature relating to this application should be directed to the receptionist at (703) 305-4900.

The official Fax numbers for the organization are (703-872-9318) Before-Final and (703-872-9319) After-Final Office actions.


Art Unit: 2858

U.S. PATENT OFFICE
Tel: (703) 305-1081
Fax: (703) 746-4461
Email: james.kerveros@uspto.gov

Date: 5/21/03
File: Non-Final Rejection

JAMES C. KERVEROS
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2858

By:



A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "James C. Kerveros" followed by the date "5/21/03".